

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-66 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 32-65 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-3, 5-15 and 17-31 have been amended to correct matters of form and to further clarify the claimed invention. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification, at least, at page 8, line 28-page 9, line 7. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by way of the present amendment.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 1-31 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a filter medium instead of a film medium. With regard to claim 6 and its dependents, the claim has been amended to clarify that the acidic material is a derivative of a polycarboxylic acid. Lastly, regarding claims 8 and 15, the questioned language has been amended to read, "one of plural groups."

As Applicant has fully addressed each of the Examiner's concerns under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,830,715 to Reinehr et al. (hereinafter "Reinehr '715").

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,800,718 to Gaudette (hereinafter "Gaudette '718").

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the above rejections.

Reinehr '715 and Gaudette '718 do not disclose that the added acid prevents hydrogen of the carboxyl group on the surface of the filter from being ionized, as is presently claimed. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicant kindly directs the Examiner's attention to the present specification Figures 2 and 4 and page 36, line 15- page 37, line 13. The present invention hinders the formation of a hydrogen bond 19a between the carboxyl group and the hydroxyl group. Therefore, the molecule of the undissolved particle is not apt to adhere to the pore wall of the filter medium (see page 37, lines 10-14).

Thus, in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding anticipation rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimuzu (JP 2000-256477)(hereinafter "Shimuzu") in view of Gaudette '718.

Claims 5-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimuzu in view of Gaudette '718 and U.S. Patent 5,618,622 to Gilbert-Laforce (hereinafter "Gilbert-Laforce '622").

Claims 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimuzu in view of Gilbert-Laforce '622.

Claims 18-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimuzu in view of Gilbert-Laforce '622 and Gaudette '718.

Applicant respectfully traverses all of the above rejections.

The cited prior art do not disclose that the added acid prevents hydrogen of the carboxyl group on the surface of the filter from being ionized, as is presently claimed. Applicant kindly directs the Examiner's attention to the present specification Figures 2 and 4 and page 36, line 15- page 37, line 13. The present invention hinders the formation of a hydrogen bond 19a between the carboxyl group and the hydroxyl group. Therefore, the molecule of the undissolved particle is not apt to adhere to the pore wall of the filter medium (see page 37, lines 10-14).

With respect to claim 15, Applicant recognizes that Gillberg-Laforce '622 and the present invention are commonly directed to modifying a surface of the filter. However, Gillberg-Laforce '622 does not clearly teach or suggest a feature that one or more substituents or acidic groups are substituted for hydrogen atoms in at least several of the plural hydroxyl groups of the presently claimed cellulose fiber (i.e., col. 1, lines 8-22; col. 2, lines 39-47; col. 4, lines 38-43 and col. 3, lines 11-23).

Therefore, even if Gillberg-Laforce '622 is combined with Shimuzu, the combined disclosures are still insufficient to arrive at the presently claimed invention.

Thus, Applicant submits that the present amendments render the outstanding rejections moot, and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the same.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Marc S. Weiner, Reg. No. 32,181 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: **FEB 13 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant